



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. 08/051,040	FILING DATE 05/05/97	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR VISSER	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 17342-000500
-------------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------

FM32/0527
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
8TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER KANG, T	
ART UNIT 3635	PAPER NUMBER 14

DATE MAILED: 05/27/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.

08/851,040

Applicant(s)

Visser

Examiner

Timothy Kang

Group Art Unit

3635



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Timothy Kang

(3) _____

(2) Darin J. Gibby

(4) _____

Date of Interview May 25, 1999Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 11

Identification of prior art discussed:

None

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant's representative basically reiterated his position that Searcy and the other stores cited by the examiner do not show separate stores having the claimed limitations. The examiner agreed with applicant's representative that it probably would not have been obvious to use dividers having a pair of openings therein with a circuiting aisle running through both of said openings, nor that the prior art of record shows of this limitation. No agreement, however, was reached as to the allowability of any of the claims.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Timothy Kang
5/25/99